



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/652,694	08/31/2000	Paul S. Gryskiewicz	INTL-0447-US (P9445)	3816

7590
Timothy N Trop
Trop Pruner & Hu PC
Ste 100
8554 Katy Freeway
Houston, TX 77024

07/30/2003

EXAMINER

YENKE, BRIAN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/652,694

Applicant(s)

GRYSKIEWICZ, PAUL S.

Examiner

BRIAN P. YENKE

Art Unit

2614

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-18.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant states that May teaches storing two scan lines in a single row of memory. Applicant states May's Fig 2a, a scan line includes 1024 bytes but the single row of memory in May holds 2048 bytes. The examiner disagrees since Fig 2a, a row of data has 1024 bytes, in the event two unscaled rows are put on one row of memory the memory row will have 2048 bytes (Fig 2b). As stated in the rejection the examiner referred to Fig 2B, which illustrates 2048 bytes per scan line, where two rows (P1 and P2) each having 1024 bytes, for a total number of row bytes of 2048 are able to be put one scan line.

Applicant states the claims calls for scaling the first and second portion wherein, unscaled, the first portion would substantially fill the first memory area. As stated in the rejection, if a scaling down operation is performed (i.e. 2 to 1), only half the original pixel information would be retained, thus reducing the size of the memory row used (applicant's drawings Fig 4b-c). As stated by the examiner in the rejection, May discloses a system where two rows may be stored on a single row, thus in the event two rows of 1024 bytes are scaled down the two scaled rows can be stored on the original unscaled first row since only 1024 bytes will be used (2048, in a 2 to 1 operation leaving 1024 bytes).

Applicant states that in May, neither the unscaled, first portion or the second portion would substantially fill the memory area since they each only take up half the memory area. The examiner disagrees as stated above, Fig 2B of May clearly shows two rows (each of 1024 bytes, for a total of 2048 bytes) being placed on one row of memory, thus the unscaled first and second portions each having 1024 bytes, thus fill the 2048 bytes of the row in this instance. As also stated above, May discloses in the background that one row of 1024 bytes may be stored on one row of memory of 1024 bytes, or two rows (Fig 2b) each of 1024 bytes may be stored on one row of memory of 2048 bytes.

Applicant states that May essentially teaches away from the claimed invention of compressing so as to put two scan lines in a memory area adapted for one scan line. Instead, the applicant states May teaches providing a memory of double capacity to take two scan lines. The examiner disagrees, as stated above, May discloses in the background (Fig 2a), where one row unscaled (1024 bytes) may be placed on one row of memory (1024 bytes), and also where (Fig 2b) two rows each of 1024 bytes (for a total of 2048 bytes) may be placed on one row of memory of 2048 bytes. That is all disclosed by May in the background. May goes on to disclose a memory system which stores data in a tiled format in a display memory, where the parameters (tile size, tile height and tile width) may be altered in response to the video mode (e.g. pixel resolution, pixel depth or the like) (col 9, line 51-62).

The primary reference Yeh, discloses a scaling data both horizontally and vertically where the memory buffer 240 stores the temporary data in a properly sized buffer (col 4, line 6-8). The examiner incorporated May which discloses that in prior art, a single row of unscaled data may occupy the entire row of memory (Fig 2a), and also, placing two rows of unscaled data on a single row of memory. May also discloses that the memory system may store data in a tiled format where the parameters (size, height and width) may be altered in response to the video mode (pixel resolution, pixel depth or the like). And as illustrated by applicant's prior art Fig 4b-c, if data is scaled down (i.e. 2 to 1) only half the original pixel information would be retained. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yeh, which discloses scaling data both horizontally and vertically, by storing the scaled horizontal (first portion) and scaled vertical (second portion) in the first memory area (one row), with May, in order to utilize the available memory, since the available memory of a scaled down signal (2 to 1) would be able to be stored in the first memory area, which stored the unscaled first portion, thereby efficiently utilizing/filling the available rows of memory.


JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600